

REMARKS

Claims 1-20, 22, and 24-25 were previously pending in the application. Claims 4, 16, 22, and 25 are canceled; claims 1, 13-14, 17-18, and 24 are amended; and new claim 26 is added herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 5-15, 17-20, 24, and 26 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

In the event that the Examiner believes that this amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance, the Applicant requests a telephonic interview between the Examiner and the Applicant's attorney Yuri Gruzdkov to discuss this amendment. The Applicant requests that the Examiner call Mr. Gruzdkov (215-557-8544) to arrange a convenient time for such an interview.

In paragraph 2, the Examiner objected to claims 2, 13, and 24 for certain informalities. More specifically, claim 2 is objected to because the "second level cannot be both a voltage between the first and third voltages *and* a voltage altogether outside the range established by the first and third voltages." Claim 13 is objected to for "missing punctuation." Claim 24 is objected to because "The language of 'two or more' should be changed to reflect that there are at least three levels."

In response, the Applicant amended claim 13 to add a period at the end of the claim. The Applicant also amended claim 24 as requested by the Examiner.

Regarding the objection to claim 2, the Applicant points out that claim 1, from which claim 2 depends, specifies that the second level is "either inside the voltage range between the first and third voltages or outside of said voltage range on the opposite side from the first level." Claim 2 further specifies that "the second level corresponds to the second voltage," which means that the second level is inside the voltage range between the first and third voltages. Thus, claim 2 narrows the above-cited limitation of claim 1 by eliminating the second of the two recited alternatives. It is therefore submitted that claim 2 is a proper dependent claim and that the Examiner's objection to that claim should be withdrawn.

In paragraph 4, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-12, 14-15, 18-20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gill. In paragraph 5, the Examiner objected to claims 4, 6, 8, 13, 16, 17, and 25 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all pending claims are allowable over Gill.

Amended claim 1 is equivalent to previously presented claim 4 rewritten in independent form. Since claim 4 was indicated as allowable, the Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is allowable. Since claims 2-3 and 5-13 depend variously from claim 1, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable.

Amended claim 14 is equivalent to previously presented claim 16 rewritten in independent form. Since claim 16 was indicated as allowable, the Applicant submits that amended claim 14 is allowable. Since claims 15 and 17 depend from claim 14, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable.

Claim 18 is amended similar to claim 14. The Applicant submits that amended claim 18 is allowable at least for some of the same reasons as claim 14. Since claims 19 and 20 depend variously from claim 18, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable.

Claim 24 is amended to include the recitations of claim 25 (now canceled). The Applicant submits that amended claim 24 is allowable because the reasons for allowability of claim 25 similarly apply to that claim.

New claim 26 is equivalent to previously presented claim 13 rewritten in independent form. Since claim 13 was indicated as allowable, the Applicant submits that claim 26 is allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 01/23/2008

Customer No. 46850

Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.

1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/Yuri Gruzdkov/

Yuri Gruzdkov

Registration No. 50,762

Attorney for Applicant

(215) 557-8544 (phone)

(215) 557-8477 (fax)